



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/612,257	07/01/2003	Christine Chen	021756-000100US	3331
51206	7590	03/16/2010	EXAMINER	
TOWNSEND AND TOWNSEND AND CREW LLP/ORACLE TWO EMBARCADERO CENTER 8TH FLOOR SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94111-3834			BOYCE, ANDRE D	
ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER			
		3623		
MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE			
03/16/2010	PAPER			

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/612,257	Applicant(s) CHEN ET AL.
	Examiner Andre Boyce	Art Unit 3623

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If no period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 18 December 2009.

2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-22 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 1-22 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a) All b) Some * c) None of:

1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)

Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____

5) Notice of Informal Patent Application

6) Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

1. This Final office action is in response to Applicant's amendment filed 12/18/09. Claims 1 and 14 have been amended. Claims 1-22 are pending.
2. Applicant's arguments filed 12/18/09 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

3. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.
4. Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Ojha et al. (U.S. Pub. No. 2002/0152104 A1).

Regarding claim 1, Ojha et al. discloses the method of updating a supply plan used to process customer requests in an available-to-promise (ATP) system (i.e., the ATP supply information is communicated to DF engine 22 in each HA system 20 in an HA system group before that system group goes on-line to become the operating HA system group. The ATP supply information may be stored by each HA system 20, ¶ 0026), the method comprising: a supply chain planning component of the ATP system updating a model of a supply chain (i.e. planning information) (paragraph [0006], lines 13-16 and paragraph [0027], lines 11-19) for one or more products sold by the ATP system (paragraph [0003], lines 11-14); the supply chain

planning component of the ATP system copying (i.e. replicating) a current supply plan used by the ATP system to process customer requests to create a second supply plan (paragraph [0027], lines 19-22); thereafter, receiving a first plurality of customers requests at the ATP system and processing orders from the requests against the current supply plan with the ATP system (paragraph [0006], lines 7-9) while running the model of the supply chain with the second supply plan (i.e. uninterrupted service) as part of a process that creates a new (i.e. updated) supply plan (paragraph [0008], lines 8-13); after the new supply plan is created, a synchronization program of the ATP system synchronizing the new supply plan by processing with the ATP system orders from the first plurality of customer requests scheduled against the current supply plan into the new supply plan (paragraph [0046], lines 1-4), wherein the synchronizing process is stopped prior to synchronizing all the orders in the first plurality of requests into the new supply plan (instruct operating HA systems to terminate processing, step 216, and generation of a stop record indicating the last processed order and termination of operation of operating HA systems, step 218 in figure 5 and ¶ 0050); thereafter, temporarily stopping promising orders with the ATP system while synchronizing with the ATP system all remaining orders from the first plurality of requests not synchronized during the synchronizing process in the new supply plan (generating a stop record indicating the last order that was processed, step 218 and processing any remaining pre-termination orders and update ATP supply information, step 222, as seen in figure 5 and ¶ 0050); and after the remaining orders from the first plurality of

requests are processed with the ATP system, replacing the current supply plan used by the ATP system with the new (i.e. updated) supply plan so that the ATP system processes future customer requests against the new (i.e. updated) supply plan (paragraph [0017], lines 6-10 and paragraph [0050], lines 6-12).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.
6. Claim 2 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ojha et al. (U.S. Pub. No. 2002/0152104 A1) as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Bush Jr. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,486,899 B1).

Regarding claim 2, Ojha et al. discloses the invention substantially as claimed. However, Ojha et al. does not disclose changing a pointer to the new supply plan and setting a flag associated with the new supply plan to indicate that the new supply plan is available for ATP processing. Bush Jr. teaches using notifications flags to display logistic information relating to supply plans (i.e. entities or distribution resources) in the supply chain (column 5, lines 6-8). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the method of Ojha et al. with the feature of changing a pointer to the new supply plan and setting a flag associated with the new supply plan, as both Ojha et al. and Bush Jr., since the claimed invention is merely a combination of old elements, and in the combination each element merely would have performed the

same function as it did separately, and one of ordinary skill in the art would have recognized that the results of the combination were predictable.

7. Claims 3-5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ojha et al. (U.S. Pub. No. 2002/0152104 A1) as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of AMR Consulting White Paper: "Planning for Tomorrow: A Tactical Approach to Supply Chain Innovation" (hereafter referred to as AMR Consulting).

Regarding claims 3-5, Ojha et al. discloses the invention substantially as claimed. However, Ojha et al. does not disclose an exception is generated (as per claim 3) and causes a message (as per claim 4) to be sent to a planner (as per claim 5) for processing if a promise made against the current supply plan cannot be made against the new supply plan. However, AMR Consulting teaches an exception causing a message to be generated (i.e. automatic notification) and sent to a planner (i.e. decision makers) for processing if a promise made against the current supply plan cannot be made against the new supply plan (i.e. when business events diverge from planning targets) (page 18, paragraph 5). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the method of Ojha et al. with the feature of an exception (as per claim 3) to cause a message to be generated (as per claim 4) and sent to a planner for processing (as per claim 5) as taught by AMR Consulting, since the claimed invention is merely a combination of old elements, and in the combination each element merely would have performed the same function as it did separately, and

one of ordinary skill in the art would have recognized that the results of the combination were predictable.

8. Claims 6, 7, 21 and 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ojha et al. (U.S. Pub. No. 2002/0152104 A1) as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Brichta (U.S. Pat. No. 5,864,483).

Regarding claims 6 and 7, Ojha et al. discloses the invention substantially as claimed. However, Ojha et al. does not explicitly disclose stopping synchronization when it is determined that a predetermined number of requests still need to be synchronized (as per claim 6), wherein the predetermined number is calculated by a system based on an average time of synchronizing each request and a desired system downtime entered by a planner (as per claim 7). Brichta teaches alerting a planner (i.e. provider) when services or products are approaching unacceptable levels relative to predetermined number of requests (i.e. predetermined criteria) (column 1, lines 61-66), wherein the predetermined number (i.e. predetermined criteria) is calculated by a system (column 7, lines 10-14) using statistical information including average time (i.e. mean) (column 2, lines 2-13, column 7, lines 20-28) based on each request and a desired system downtime (i.e. service information) (column 7, lines 14-17). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the method of Ojha et al. with the feature of stopping synchronization (i.e. appropriate action) (column 2, lines 14-17) when it is determined that a predetermined number of

requests still need to be synchronized (as per claim 6), wherein the predetermined number is calculated by a system based on an average time (i.e. mean) of synchronizing each request and a desired system downtime entered by a planner (i.e. provider) (as per claim 7), as seen in Brichta, since the claimed invention is merely a combination of old elements, and in the combination each element merely would have performed the same function as it did separately, and one of ordinary skill in the art would have recognized that the results of the combination were predictable.

Regarding claims 21 and 22, Ojha et al does not explicitly disclose wherein the synchronization process is stopped prior to synchronizing a predetermined number of orders remaining in the first plurality of requests taken after a predetermined time, and wherein the synchronization process is stopped prior to synchronizing a predetermined number of orders in the first plurality of requests based on a predetermined percentage of orders that can be processed in a predetermined period of time.

Brichta teaches alerting a planner (i.e. provider) when services or products are approaching unacceptable levels relative to predetermined number of requests (i.e. predetermined criteria) (column 1, lines 61-66), wherein the predetermined number (i.e. predetermined criteria) is calculated by a system (column 7, lines 10-14) using statistical information including average time (i.e. mean) (column 2, lines 2-13, column 7, lines 20-28) based on each request and a desired system downtime (i.e. service information) (column 7, lines 14-17). Therefore, it would have been obvious

to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the method of Ojha et al. with the features of the synchronization process is stopped prior to synchronizing a predetermined number of orders remaining in the first plurality of requests taken after a predetermined time, and wherein the synchronization process is stopped prior to synchronizing a predetermined number of orders in the first plurality of requests based on a predetermined percentage of orders that can be processed in a predetermined period of time, as seen in Brichta, since the claimed invention is merely a combination of old elements, and in the combination each element merely would have performed the same function as it did separately, and one of ordinary skill in the art would have recognized that the results of the combination were predictable.

9. Claims 8 and 9 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ojha et al. (U.S. Pub. No. 2002/0152104 A1) as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Syed et al. (U.S. Pat. No. RE39,549 E).

Regarding claim 8, Ojha et al. discloses the invention substantially as claimed. However, Ojha et al. does not disclose prior to running the model, capturing a snapshot of data representing actual sales and promised requests for use in the creation of the new supply plan. Syed et al. teaches obtaining a snapshot time from a database server to return data that reflects a database state associated with the snapshot time (column 1, lines 64-67 to column 2, lines 1-4). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention

was made to combine the method of Ojha et al. with the feature of capturing a snapshot of data representing actual sales and promised requests as taught by Syed et al., since the claimed invention is merely a combination of old elements, and in the combination each element merely would have performed the same function as it did separately, and one of ordinary skill in the art would have recognized that the results of the combination were predictable.

Regarding claim 9, Ojha et al. discloses the invention substantially as claimed. However, Ojha et al. does not disclose creating a summary table from the new supply plan that can be used by the ATP system to quickly retrieve summarized availability information without computing availability from more detailed supply and demand tables. Syed et al. teaches relational database storing data in tables (column 5, lines 12-17). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the method of Ojha et al. with the feature of creating a summary table (i.e. subset of the table) (column 5, lines 47-52) from the new supply plan as taught by Syed et al., since the claimed invention is merely a combination of old elements, and in the combination each element merely would have performed the same function as it did separately, and one of ordinary skill in the art would have recognized that the results of the combination were predictable.

10. Claims 10, 11, 14, 15, 19 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ojha et al. (U.S. Pub. No. 2002/0152104 A1).

Regarding claim 10, Ojha et al. discloses the invention substantially as claimed.

Ojha et al. discloses pre-allocating products available (i.e. forecasts of future customer demand) (paragraph [0003], lines 5-11). However, Ojha et al. does explicitly teach pre-allocating products available for promising in the new supply plan. It is common knowledge in the prior art that organizations previously define business objectives. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to pre-allocate products available for promising to both the current and new supply plan in Ojha et al, since the claimed invention is merely a combination of old elements, and in the combination each element merely would have performed the same function as it did separately, and one of ordinary skill in the art would have recognized that the results of the combination were predictable.

Regarding claim 11, Ojha et al. discloses the invention substantially as claimed. Ojha et al. discloses after switching (i.e. replacing) (paragraph [0006], lines 21-22) to the new supply plan, promising orders from the requests against the new supply plan (paragraph [0004], lines 3-6). However, Ojha et al. does not explicitly disclose receiving and promising a second plurality of customers request by the ATP system against the new supply plan. It is common knowledge in the prior art that a second plurality of requests is received after the first plurality of request once the supply plan is switched (i.e. replaced). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to receive and promise orders from a second plurality of requests by the ATP system after the supply plan is

switched (i.e. replaced) against the new supply plan in Ojha et al, since the claimed invention is merely a combination of old elements, and in the combination each element merely would have performed the same function as it did separately, and one of ordinary skill in the art would have recognized that the results of the combination were predictable.

Regarding claim 14, Ojha et al. teaches the method of managing available-to-promise sales orders (i.e., the ATP supply information is communicated to DF engine 22 in each HA system 20 in an HA system group before that system group goes on-line to become the operating HA system group. The ATP supply information may be stored by each HA system 20, ¶ 0026), the method comprising: an order processing component of an available-to-promise (ATP) system receiving a first plurality of requests from customers before creating a new supply plan; and promising orders (paragraph [0004], lines 3-6) from the first plurality of requests against a first supply plan used by the ATP system (paragraph [0006], lines 1-7); creating a new supply plan with the ATP system (i.e. modifying) (paragraph [0006], lines 7-9); receiving at the ATP system requests from customers (i.e. uninterrupted service) while the new supply plan is being created (paragraph [0008], lines 8-13); promising with the ATP system orders from the requests against the first supply plan (paragraph [0004], lines 3-6); synchronizing with the ATP system a first portion of the first plurality of requests between the first supply plan and the new supply plan (paragraph [0046], lines 1-4); stopping synchronization with the ATP system after synchronizing the first portion of the first plurality of requests between the first supply

plan and the new supply plan (instruct operating HA systems to terminate processing, step 216, and generation of a stop record indicating the last processed order and termination of operation of operating HA systems, step 218 in figure 5 and ¶ 0050); temporarily stopping processing orders with the ATP system while processing with the ATP system a second portion of the first plurality of requests between the first supply plan and the new supply plan and while processing with the ATP system the second plurality of requests (generating a stop record indicating the last order that was processed, step 218 and processing any remaining pre-termination orders and update ATP supply information, step 222, as seen in figure 5 and ¶ 0050); invalidating (i.e. terminating) with the ATP system the first supply plan and activating (i.e. take over) the new supply plan (paragraph [0017], lines 6-10 and paragraph [0050], lines 6-12); receiving at the ATP system requests from customers, and promising orders from the requests against the new supply plan (paragraph [0004], lines 3-6 and paragraph [0035], lines 15-20).

However, Ojha et al. does not explicitly disclose receiving a second and third plurality of requests from customers, wherein the second plurality of requests is received after the first plurality of requests, the third plurality of requests is received after the second plurality of requests and after the first supply plan is invalidated and the new supply plan is activated; promising orders from the second plurality of requests against the first supply plan, and promising orders from the third plurality of requests against the new supply plan. It is common knowledge in the prior art that a second plurality of requests is received after the first plurality of request; the third

plurality of requests is received after the second plurality of requests. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have the second plurality of requests received after the first plurality of requests, the third plurality of requests received after the second plurality of requests; and promising orders from the second plurality of requests against the first supply plan, and promising orders from the third plurality of requests against the new supply plan (paragraph [0004], lines 3-6) in Ojha et al, since the claimed invention is merely a combination of old elements, and in the combination each element merely would have performed the same function as it did separately, and one of ordinary skill in the art would have recognized that the results of the combination were predictable.

Regarding claim 15, Ojha et al. teaches copying (i.e. replicating) the first supply plan and creating the new supply plan from the copy (i.e. replicate) of the first supply plan (paragraph [0027], lines 19-22).

Regarding claim 19, Ojha et al. teaches the invention substantially as claimed. However, Ojha et al. does not explicitly disclose synchronizing a first subset of the second plurality of requests scheduled against the old supply plan into the new supply plan (i.e. modified plan) by processing the second plurality of request against the new supply plan. It is common knowledge in the prior art that a second plurality of requests is received after the first plurality of request. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to synchronize a first subset of the second plurality of requests scheduled

against the old supply plan into the new supply plan (i.e. modified plan) by processing the second plurality of request against the new supply plan (paragraph [0006], lines 1-20) in Ojha et al, since the claimed invention is merely a combination of old elements, and in the combination each element merely would have performed the same function as it did separately, and one of ordinary skill in the art would have recognized that the results of the combination were predictable.

Regarding claim 20, Ojha et al. teaches temporarily stopping promising orders (i.e. not online) (paragraph [0045], lines 6-11 and paragraph [0048], lines 1-4); and synchronizing all remaining requests from the second plurality of requests not synchronized during the synchronizing the first subset (paragraph [0050], lines 12-21).

11. Claim 12, 13 and 16-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ojha et al. (U.S. Pub. No. 2002/0152104 A1) as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Aram (U.S. Pub. No. 2002/0072988 A1).

Regarding claims 12, 13, 16 and 18, Ojha et al. discloses the method of updating a supply plan and available-to-promise system for processing customer requests, the system comprising: a supply chain planning component (i.e. Advanced Planning and Scheduling engine) configured to allow a planner to update (i.e. modify) (paragraph [006], lines 1-9) a model of a supply chain (i.e. planning information) for one or more products sold by the ATP system paragraph (paragraph [0003], lines 11-14); an order promising component (i.e. Advanced Planning and Scheduling

engine) configured to allow a planner to update an old supply plan used to process requests with a new supply plan (paragraph [0006], lines 13-16, paragraph [0008], lines 8-13) by (i) copying (i.e. replicating) a current supply plan used by the ATP system to process customer requests to create a second supply plan (paragraph [0027], lines 19-22); (ii) thereafter, receiving a first plurality of customer requests at the ATP system and promising orders from the first plurality of requests against the current supply plan (paragraph [0006], lines 7-9) while the ATP system runs the model of the supply chain process with the second supply plan (i.e. uninterrupted service) as part of a process that creates a new supply plan (paragraph [0008], lines 8-13); (iii) after the new supply plan is created, synchronizing orders from the first plurality of customer requests scheduled against the current supply plan into the new supply plan (paragraph [0046], lines 1-4); stopping synchronization of orders of the first plurality of customer requests prior to synchronizing all the orders of the first plurality of customer requests (instruct operating HA systems to terminate processing, step 216, and generation of a stop record indicating the last processed order and termination of operation of operating HA systems, step 218 in figure 5 and ¶ 0050); thereafter, temporarily stopping promising orders from new customer requests received at the ATP system while checking all remaining orders from the first plurality of requests not checked during the synchronizing process against the new supply plan (generating a stop record indicating the last order that was processed, step 218 and processing any remaining pre-termination orders and update ATP supply information, step 222, as seen in figure 5 and ¶ 0050); and (v)

after the remaining orders from the first plurality of requests are processed, switching the new plan supply for the current supply plan so that the ATP system can process future customer requests against the new supply plan (paragraph [0017], lines 6-10 and paragraph [0050], lines 6-12).

However Ojha et al. does not disclose processing a first subset of the plurality of customer requests against the new supply plan until a threshold number of orders in the first plurality of requests is reaches (as per claim 16), stopping the synchronizing process when a number of outstanding orders not synchronized into the new plan reaches a threshold number of orders in the first plurality of requests (as per claim 12), wherein the threshold number is a user defined limit (as per claim 13 and 18). Aram teaches assisting identification at which there is a risk of a level of outstanding orders (i.e. customer demand data) falling below a threshold value (paragraph [0065], lines 1-12), wherein the outstanding orders (i.e. customer demand data) is a user defined threshold (i.e. input by user) (paragraph [0066], lines 3-5). Therefore, it would have been obvious for one having ordinary skill at the time the invention was made to combine the method taught by Ojha et al. with the feature processing a first subset of the plurality of customer requests against the new supply plan until a threshold number of orders in the first plurality of requests is reaches (as per claim 16), stopping the synchronizing process when a number of outstanding orders not synchronized into the new plan reaches a threshold number of orders in the first plurality of requests (as per claim 12), wherein the threshold number is a user defined limit (as per claim 13 and 18) as taught by Aram, since the claimed invention

is merely a combination of old elements, and in the combination each element merely would have performed the same function as it did separately, and one of ordinary skill in the art would have recognized that the results of the combination were predictable.

Regarding claim 17, Ojha et al. discloses a demand planning component (i.e. demand fulfillment engine) configured to allow a planner to create a demand plan (paragraph [0019], lines 7-14 and paragraph [0024], lines 10-14) that can be used by the supply chain planning component to model a supply chain (paragraph [0019], lines 14-18).

Response to Arguments

12. In the Remarks, with respect to independent claims 1, 14 and 16, Applicant argues that Ojha et al fails to disclose a synchronization program synchronizing the new supply plan by processing orders from the first plurality of customer requests scheduled against the current supply plan into the new supply plan, wherein the synchronizing process is stopped prior to synchronizing all the orders in the first plurality of requests into the new supply plan. The Examiner continues to respectfully disagree. Ojha et al discloses updating planning information and synchronizing that planning information between operating systems (¶ 0046). In addition, Ojha et al disclose instructing operating HA systems to terminate processing, step 216, and generation of a stop record indicating the last processed order and termination of operation of operating HA systems, step 218, as seen in

figure 5 and ¶ 0050. As such, Ojha et al indeed discloses wherein the synchronizing process is stopped prior to synchronizing all the orders in the first plurality of requests into the new supply plan. Moreover, Ojha et al disclose generating a stop record indicating the last order that was processed, step 218 and processing any remaining pre-termination orders and update ATP supply information, step 222, as seen in figure 5 and ¶ 0050.

In addition, Applicant argues not only does Ojha not anticipate an available-to-promise system or other system using such a synchronization as part of a process to replace a supply plan in use by the ATP system, but the Applicants respectfully contend that Ojha actually teaches away from synchronizing and replacing a supply plan within a given system. The Examiner respectfully disagrees and submits that Ojha et al disclose the ATP supply information is communicated to DF engine 22 in each HA system 20 in an HA system group before that system group goes on-line to become the operating HA system group. The ATP supply information may be stored by each HA system 20 (¶ 0026) and the new operating primary HA system 20a' may process or replay (as in step 214) any remaining pre-termination orders that were already processed by primary HA system 20a and update the HA supply information in ATP systems 20' accordingly (¶ 0050).

Conclusion

13. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

14. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Andre Boyce whose telephone number is (571)272-6726. The examiner can normally be reached on 9:30-6pm M-F.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Beth Boswell can be reached on (571) 272-6737. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Andre Boyce/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 3623
March 14, 2010